

The Gazette of India

EXTRAORDINARY

PART II—Section 3

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 122] NEW DELHI, MONDAY, MAY 18, 1953

DELIMITATION COMMISSION, INDIA

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 18th May, 1953

S. R. O. 920.—In pursuance of clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952 (LXXXI of 1952), the Delimitation Commission hereby publishes its proposals in respect of the determination of numbers under sub-section (1) of the said section and specifies the 3rd June, 1953 as the date on or after which the proposals will be further considered by it.

Any objections or suggestions in regard to these proposals should reach the Secretary of the Delimitation Commission (No. 1, Aurangzeb Road, New Delhi) before the said date. It would facilitate prompt consideration if they are in English and four spare copies are sent.

PROPOSALS

I. The number of seats to be allotted to each of the States in the House of the People and the number of seats, if any, to be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and for the Scheduled Tribes of the State shall be as shown in columns (3), (4) and (5) of the Table below.

II. The number of seats to be assigned to the Legislative Assembly of each Part A State and of each Part B State other than Jammu and Kashmir and the number, if any, to be reserved

therein for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes of the State shall be as shown in columns (6), (7) and (8) of the Table below :—

TABLE

| S. No. | Name of State | HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE | | | STATE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY | | |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | Total number of seats | Number reserved for Scheduled Castes | Number reserved for Scheduled Tribes ^a | Total number of seats | Number reserved for Scheduled Castes | Number reserved for Scheduled Tribes |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1 | Uttar Pradesh . . . | 86 | 16 | .. | 430 | 78 | .. |
| 2 | Bihar . . . | 55 | 7 | 6 | 330 | 41 | 33 |
| 3 | Bombay . . . | 49 | 4 | 5 | 294 | 25 | 27 |
| 4 | Madras . . . | 49 | 8 | .. | 245 | 39 | 1 |
| 5 | West Bengal . . . | 34 | 6 | 2 | 238 | 45 | 11 |
| 6 | Madhya Pradesh ^b . . . | 29 | 4 | 3 | 232 | 32 | 27 |
| 7 | Andhra . . . | 28 | 4 | 1 | 168 | 22 | 4 |
| 8 | Hyderabad ^c . . . | 25 | 4 | .. | 175 | 26 | 3 |
| 9 | Rajasthan . . . | 21 | 2 | .. | 168 | 18 | 3 |
| 10 | Orissa . . . | 20 | 4 | 4 | 140 | 25 | 28 |
| 11 | Punjab . . . | 17 | 3 | .. | 119 | 22 | .. |
| 12 | Mysore . . . | 13 | 2 | .. | 117 | 21 | .. |
| 13 | Travancore-Cochin . . . | 13 | 1 | .. | 104 | 10 | .. |
| 14 | Assam . . . | 12 | 1 | 2 | *108 | 5 | 9 |
| 15 | Madhya Bharat . . . | 11 | 2 | 1 | 99 | 16 | 13 |
| 16 | Jammu and Kashmir . . . | 6 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 17 | Saurashtra . . . | 6 | .. | .. | 60 | 2 | 1 |
| 18 | Patiala and East Punjab States Union . . . | 5 | .. | .. | 60 | 12 | .. |
| 19 | Vindhya Pradesh . . . | .. | .. | 1 | .. | .. | .. |
| 20 | Delhi . . . | 3 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 21 | Himachal Pradesh . . . | 2 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 22 | Bhopal . . . | 2 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 23 | Ajmer . . . | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 24 | Tripura . . . | 2 | .. | 1 | .. | .. | .. |
| 25 | Manipur . . . | 2 | .. | 1 | .. | .. | .. |
| 26 | Kutch . . . | 2 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 27 | Coorg . . . | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 28 | Bilaspur . . . | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| TOTAL . . . | | 500 | 70 | 27 | .. | .. | .. |

*NOTE.—Out of these 108 seats, 18 seats will be reserved for the autonomous Districts of Assam as follows :—

| | |
|---|----|
| United Khasi and Jaintia Hills District . . . | 5 |
| Garo Hills District . . . | 4 |
| Lushai Hills District . . . | 3 |
| Naga Hills District . . . | 3 |
| North Cachar Hills . . . | 1 |
| Mikir Hills . . . | 2 |
| TOTAL . . . | 18 |

EXPLANATORY NOTES

As required by the Act, the above proposals have been formulated on the basis of the latest census figures which for convenience of reference are set out in the Appendix. It is assumed that the State of Andhra will be constituted in the near future with the territories indicated in the Prime Minister's announcement and that a part of the Bellary district will be transferred from the State of Madras to the State of Mysore.

Allotment of seats in the House of the People.—In Article 81 (1) (a) of the Constitution it is laid down that the House of the People shall consist of not more than 500 members directly elected by voters in the States. The Commission's proposals provide for the allocation among the States of the maximum number of 500 elective seats. The four seats filled by nomination (one to represent the Part B tribal areas of Assam, one to represent the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and two to represent the Anglo-Indian community) are not included in the Table.

Taking the Part C States first, four of them, Tripura, Manipur, Kutch and Bilaspur, which have no Legislative Assemblies, have to be allotted the same number of seats as they have at present, namely, 2, 2, 2 and 1 respectively: *vide* proviso to section 8 (1) of the Act. Coorg also must obviously continue to have one seat as at present. On the all-India average of 7·22 lakhs per seat, the States of Vindhya Pradesh, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh and Ajmer cannot continue to enjoy the weightage they have at present in the House of the People. In each of these cases, the number of representatives has been reduced by one so that these four States get 5, 3, 2 and 1 respectively, or 11 seats in all. The representation of Bhopal which has a population of 836,474 cannot very well be reduced from 2 to 1, and accordingly the present number of 2 has been retained for that State. The total number of seats allotted to the Part C States thus comes to 21.

The allocation of the remaining 479 seats among the Part A and Part B States has been made strictly on the basis of the latest census figures in the following manner. The total population of these States comes to 351,099,040 which, divided by 479, gives an average of 732,983 per seat. The population of each State is divided by this latter number and the nearest integral number of seats allotted to that State. Similarly, the number of seats proposed to be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, if any, in each State has been calculated strictly in accordance with the provisions of Article 330, fractions less than one-half being ignored and fractions not less than one-half being taken as one. The calculations are shown in Part I of the Appendix.

Assignment of seats to the Legislative Assemblies.—According to section 8 (1) (b) of the Act, the total number of seats to be assigned to the Legislative Assembly of each Part A State and of each Part B State, other than Jammu and Kashmir, has to form an integral multiple of the total number of seats allotted to that State in the House of the People. It will be observed from the table above, in which the States have been listed in descending order of population, that as we go down the list the multiple generally increases from 5 to 12 and the total strength of the Assembly diminishes from 430 to 60. In the majority of cases the existing strength of the Legislative Assembly has been maintained unaltered, but a change is necessary in a few States for reasons explained below.

For Bombay which has been allotted 49 seats in the House of the People, it is proposed that the multiple should be 6, giving an Assembly of 294 members instead of 315 as at present. The retention of the existing multiple of 7 would have meant an increase in the strength of the Assembly to 343 which does not seem necessary. The proposed reduction of the total number of members by 21 would involve only a slight increase in the extent and population of an average Assembly constituency, which in an advanced and well-developed State like Bombay should not be material.

After the formation of the Andhra State, the population of Madras State will entitle it to 49 seats in the House of the People. The present multiple for undivided Madras is 5, and it is proposed to retain it, giving an Assembly of 245.

Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan have at present a comparatively high multiple of 8. The Commission proposes to maintain it in both the States, mainly because of the low density of population (163 and 117, respectively, per square mile) and poor communications.

For the new State of Andhra a multiple of 6, giving an Assembly of 168 members, is proposed.

According to the census figures, Punjab is allotted 17 seats in the House of the People in place of the existing 18. It is, however, proposed to retain the existing multiple of 7, giving a Legislative Assembly of 119 members.

On the assumption that the major part of Bellary district will be transferred to Mysore when the Andhra State is formed, Mysore will be entitled to 13 seats in the House of the People instead of the existing 11. It is proposed to retain the existing multiple of 9, which will give a Legislative Assembly of 117 members.

Since Travancore-Cochin gets one more seat in the House of the People the total strength of the Assembly will have either to be increased from 108 to 117 or reduced slightly to 104. In a densely populated State with small-sized constituencies it appears unnecessary to increase the size of the Assembly to 117 by retaining the existing multiple of 9. It is accordingly proposed to fix the strength of the Assembly at 104, the multiple being 8.

In Assam, it is proposed to retain the existing number of reservations for the autonomous districts in all cases. According to Article 342 (4) of the Constitution, the number of seats reserved for each of the six autonomous districts should bear to the total number of seats in the Assembly a proportion not less than the population of the district bears to the total population of the State. Strictly according to the population figures, it would be sufficient to give three seats to the Garo Hills district in place of the existing 4. The Associate Members of Assam were, however, unanimous in suggesting that a reduction affecting only one of the autonomous districts would be liable to be misunderstood by its tribal population and that there would be no harm in giving four seats to this district. It is, therefore, proposed to leave the number of reserved seats for all the autonomous districts as they are at present.

APPENDIX

I

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

| S. No. | Name of State | 1951 Census population | | | Proportion to total population of | | Number of seats | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Total | Scheduled Castes | Scheduled Tribes | Scheduled Castes | Scheduled Tribes | Total | Scheduled Castes | Scheduled Tribes |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| 1. | Uttar Pradesh | 63,215,742 | 11,479,102 | .. | ·1816 | .. | 86·24=86 | 15·62=16 | .. |
| 2. | Bihar | 40,225,947 | 5,057,812 | 4,049,183 | ·1257 | ·1007 | 54·88=55 | 6·91=7 | 5·54=6 |
| 3. | Bombay. | 35,956,150 | 3,003,024 | 3,359,305 | ·0835 | ·0934 | 49·06=49 | 4·09=4 | 4·58=5 |
| 4. | Madras | 35,734,489 | 5,672,126 | 126,470 | ·1587 | ·0035 | 48·75=49 | 7·78=8 | 0·17=0 |
| 5. | West Bengal | 24,810,308 | 4,696,205 | 1,165,337 | ·1893 | ·0470 | 33·85=34 | 6·44=6 | 1·60=2 |
| 6. | Madhya Pradesh | 21,247,533 | 2,898,968 | 2,477,024 | ·1364 | ·1166 | 28·99=29 | 3·96=4 | 3·38=3 |
| 7. | Andhra | 20,507,801 | 2,712,939 | 509,098 | ·1323 | ·0248 | 27·98=28 | 3·70=4 | 0·69=1 |
| 8. | Hyderabad | 18,655,108 | 2,800,184 | 354,933 | ·1501 | ·0190 | 25·45=25 | 3·75=4 | 0·48=0 |
| 9. | Rajasthan | 15,290,797 | 1,609,074 | 316,348 | ·1052 | ·0207 | 20·86=21 | 2·21=2 | 0·43=0 |
| 10. | Orissa | 14,645,946 | 2,630,763 | 2,967,334 | ·1796 | ·2026 | 19·98=20 | 3·59=4 | 4·05=4 |
| 11. | Punjab | 12,641,205 | 2,386,143 | 2,429 | ·1888 | ·0002 | 17·25=17 | 3·21=3 | 0·003=0 |
| 12. | Mysore | 9,848,684 | 1,757,388 | 15,721 | ·1784 | ·0016 | 13·44=13 | 2·32=2 | 0·02=0 |
| 13. | Travancore-Cochin | 9,280,425 | 870,139 | 26,580 | ·0938 | ·0029 | 12·66=13 | 1·22=1 | 0·04=0 |
| 14. | Assam | 9,043,707 | 424,044 | 1,735,245 | ·0469 | ·1919 | 12·34=12 | 0·56=1 | 2 |
| 15. | Madhya Bharat | 7,954,154 | 1,323,881 | 1,060,812 | ·1664 | ·34 | 10·85=11 | 1·83=2 | 1·47=1 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| 16. | Jammu and Kashmir | 4,410,000 | .. | .. | .. | 6.02=6 | .. | .. | |
| 17. | Saurashtra | 4,137,359 | 119,358 | 38,849 | .0288 | .0094 | 5.64=6 | 0.17=0 | 0.06=0 |
| 18. | Patwala and East Punjab States Union. | 3,493,685 | 676,302 | .. | .1936 | .. | 4.77=5 | 0.97=1 | .. |
| 19. | Vindhya Pradesh | 3,574,690 | 476,234 | 418,282 | .1332 | .1170 | 5] | 0.67=1 | 0.59=1 |
| 20. | Delhi | 1,744,072 | 208,612 | .. | .1196 | .. | 3] | 0.36=0 | .. |
| 21. | Himachal Pradesh | 983,367 | 224,610 | .. | .2284 | .. | 2 | 0.46=0 | .. |
| 22. | Bhopal | 836,474 | 129,370 | 59,114 | .1347 | .0707 | 2 | 0.31=0 | 0.14=0 |
| 23. | Ajmer | 693,372 | 80,974 | 9,816 | .1168 | .0142 | 1 | 0.12=0 | 0.01=0 |
| 24. | Tripura | 639,029 | 46,371 | 192,293 | .0726 | .3009 | 2 | 0.15=0] | 0.60=1 |
| 25. | Manipur | 577,635 | .. | 194,239 | .. | .3363 | 2 | .. | 0.67=1 |
| 26. | Kutch | 567,606 | 7,450 | 17,002 | .0131 | .0300 | 2 | 0.03=0 | 0.06=0 |
| 27. | Coorg | 229,405 | 25,690 | 21,084 | .1120 | .0919 | 1 | 0.11=0 | 0.09=0 |
| 28. | Bilaspur | 126,099 | 27,135 | .. | .2152 | .. | 1 | 0.22=0 | .. |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 361,070,789 | 51,343,898 | 19,116,498 | .. | .. | 500 | 70 | 27 |

Note.—(1) The population of Madras, Andhra and Mysore States are shown as they will be after the proposed formation of the State of Andhra and in doing so, it has been assumed that the Bellary taluk will be included in the Mysore State.

(2) The numbers in column (8) for Part A and B States are determined by dividing the numbers in column (3) by 732,983, which is the average population per seat.

(3) The numbers in columns (9) and (10) are determined by multiplying the ratios in columns (6) and (7) respectively by the corresponding numbers in column (8).

(4) One of the two seats reserved for the Scheduled Tribes in Assam is reserved for the Scheduled Tribes of Assam excluding the tribal areas,] and the other for the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts. The calculations are as follows :—

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| (a) Population of Assam | 9,043,707 |
| (b) Population of Scheduled tribes of Assam excluding Tribal areas | 4715,728 |
| (c) Population of Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts | 1,019,517 |
| (d) Proportion of (b) to (a) | .0791 |
| (e) Proportion of (c) to (a) | .1127 |
| (f) Seat to be reserved for (b) | $12 \times .0791 = 0.95 = 1$ |
| (g) Seat to be reserved for (c) | $12 \times .1127 = 1.35 = 1$ |

II

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES

| S. No. | Name of State | 1951 Census population | | | Proportion to total population of | | Number of seats | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Total | Scheduled Castes | Scheduled Tribes | Scheduled Castes | Scheduled Tribes | Total | Scheduled Castes | Scheduled Tribes |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| 1. | Uttar Pradesh | 63,215,742 | 11,479,102 | .. | ·1816 | .. | 430 | 78·09=78 | .. |
| 2. | Bihar | 40,225,947 | 5,057,812 | 4,049,183 | ·1257 | ·1007 | 330 | 41·48=41 | 33·23=33 |
| 3. | Bombay | 35,956,150 | 3,003,024 | 3,359,305 | ·0835 | ·0934 | 294 | 24·55=25 | 27·46=27 |
| 4. | Madras | 35,734,489 | 5,672,126 | 126,470 | ·1587 | ·0035 | 245 | 38·88=39 | 0·86=1 |
| 5. | West Bengal | 24,810,308 | 4,696,205 | 1,165,337 | ·1893 | ·0470 | 238 | 45·05=45 | 11·19=11 |
| 6. | Madhya Pradesh | 21,247,533 | 2,898,968 | 2,477,024 | ·1364 | ·1166 | 232 | 31·64=32 | 27·05=27 |
| 7. | Andhra | 20,507,801 | 2,712,939 | 509,098 | ·1323 | ·0248 | 168 | 22·23=22 | 4·17= 4 |
| 8. | Hyderabad | 18,655,108 | 2,800,184 | 354,933 | ·1501 | ·0190 | 175 | 26·27=26 | 3·33= 3 |
| 9. | Rajasthan | 15,290,797 | 1,609,074 | 316,348 | ·1052 | ·0207 | 168 | 17·67=18 | 3·48= 3 |
| 10. | Orissa | 14,645,946 | 2,630,763 | 2,967,334 | ·1796 | ·2026 | 140 | 25·14=25 | 28·36=28 |
| 11. | Punjab | 12,641,205 | 2,386,143 | 2,429 | ·1888 | ·0002 | 119 | 22·47=22 | 0·02= 0 |
| 12. | Mysore | 9,848,684 | 1,757,388 | 15,721 | ·1784 | ·0016 | 117 | 20·87=21 | 0·19= 0 |
| 13. | Travancore-Cochin | 9,280,425 | 870,139 | 26,580 | ·0938 | ·0029 | 104 | 9·76=10 | 0·30= 0 |
| 14. | Assam | 9,043,707 | 424,044 | 1,735,245 | ·0469 | ·1919 | 108 | 5·07= 5 | 9 |
| 15. | Madhya Bharat | 7,954,154 | 1,323,881 | 1,060,812 | ·1664 | ·1334 | 99 | 16·47=16 | 13·21=13 |
| 16. | Saurashtra | 4,137,359 | 119,358 | 38,849 | ·0288 | ·0094 | 60 | 1·73= 2 | 0·56= 1 |
| 17. | Patiala and East Punjab States Union. | 3,493,685 | 676,302 | .. | ·1936 | .. | 60 | 11·62=12 | .. |
| TOTAL | | 346,689,040 | 50,117,452 | 18,204,668 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |

Note.—(1) The population of Madras, Andhra and Mysore States are shown as they will be after the proposed formation of the State of Andhra and in doing so, it has been assumed that the Bellary Taluk will be included in the Mysore State.

(2) The numbers in columns (9) and (10) have been determined by multiplying the ratios in columns (6) and (7) respectively by the corresponding numbers in column (8) except in the case of Assam as regards Scheduled Tribes, for which see below :—

| | |
|--|--|
| (a) Population of Assam | 9,043,707 |
| (b) Population of Scheduled Tribes in Assam excluding the tribal areas | 715,728 |
| (c) Population of (b) to (a) | ·0791 |
| (d) Number of seats reserved for these Scheduled Tribes | $108 \times \cdot 0791 = 8 \cdot 53 = 9$ |
| (e) Autonomous districts :— | |

| | Population | Proportion to total population of Assam | Number of seats reserved |
|--|------------|---|--------------------------|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 1. United Khasi and Jaintia Hills district | 349,215 | ·0386 | $4 \cdot 12 = 5$ |
| 2. Garo Hills district | 242,075 | ·0268 | $2 \cdot 88 = 4$ |
| 3. Lushai Hills district | 196,202 | ·0217 | $2 \cdot 34 = 3$ |
| 4. Naga Hills district | 205,950 | ·0228 | $2 \cdot 46 = 3$ |
| 5. North Cachar Hills | 39,663 | ·0044 | $0 \cdot 48 = 1$ |
| 6. Mikir Hills | 125,777 | ·0139 | $1 \cdot 50 = 2$ |

MINUTES OF DISSENT

BIHAR

Certain castes, who were included in 1931 census, have been excluded in the present census from the Scheduled Castes list, though they satisfy all the tests and criteria of being a scheduled caste, which have been laid down by the Ministry of Home Affairs in this regard.

A comparison of census figures of 1931, 1941 and 1951 is sufficient to show that the total population of Bihar has increased as is evident from the following:—

| Total population as per census of 1931 | Total population as per census of 1941 | Total population as per census of 1951 |
|--|---|---|
| 32,371,434 | 36,340,151 | 40,225,947 |
| | i. e. an increase of 11.3% over the census of 1931. | i. e. an increase of 10.7% over the census of 1941. |

But to our utter dismay and great surprise the present population of the Scheduled Castes is even less than 1931 census as is evident from the following:—

Population of the Scheduled Castes in the State of Bihar.

| 1931 | 1941 | 1951 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 5,061,144 | 4,340,319 | 5,057,812 |

Hence, I cannot accept the present figure. It is all round admitted that the percentage of the poor section of society increases more rapidly than the well-to-do people. As the Scheduled Castes are poor people, it is inconceivable that their population has not increased accordingly.

I, therefore, think that the Delimitation Commission should do to maintain a *status quo* of the present representation of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. I feel you have to work on figures before you, but I must protest against this new proposal.

NAYANTARA DAS, M.P.,
Associate Member.

BOMBAY

While agreeing with the proposals regarding the number of representatives to the House of the People from the Bombay State I am unable to endorse the proposals in respect of the number of seats to the Bombay State Legislative Assembly for reasons mentioned below:

The Delimitation Act under which this Commission came into existence was passed to implement the provisions of articles 81(3) and 170(4) and the Commission has to readjust the number of seats both to the House of the People and various State Assemblies on the basis of the latest census figures.

The two articles mentioned above provide for the maximum number of seats that the House of the People and the State Assemblies. According to these provisions on the basis of the existing population, the total number of seats to the Bombay State Assembly could go up to 479 without contravening the provision that not more than one member for every 75,000 of the population.

The total strength of the Bombay State Assembly at present is 315. I do not mind if this strength is maintained. It is true that this could not be done if the total number of seats assigned to the Legislative Assembly is to form an integral multiple of the total number of seats allotted to the House of the People

from the Bombay State in so far the number of seats to the House of the People have gone up from 45 to 49. This condition of integral multiple that is laid down in clause 8(b) was it seems, intended as a practical device to enable the Government to hold simultaneous elections for the House of the People and the State Assemblies and also the use of the same voters' list for both. This, however, would cause difficulties every time the readjustment is to be made on the basis of the last preceding census. The Commission has recommended the reduction in the strength in the Bombay State Legislative Assembly from 315 to 294 to fulfil this condition. This change is not warranted by any decrease in the population of the Bombay State. The reduction in the total number of seats is entirely prompted to avoid the increase from 315 to 343.

There is nothing wrong I submit in raising the strength from 315 to 343 because we shall be still within the maximum limit prescribed, namely, that of 479 on the basis of the present census figures. Besides, it will lead to a better and more effective association of the people with the Government inasmuch as every member will find it easy to maintain contact with a smaller number of voters. It might also give more representation to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes.

One of the arguments advanced in favour of reduction is that an assembly with 343 members would become unwieldy. It was also suggested that only a small number really contributes to the debate, hence it was said that nothing would be lost if the present strength is reduced. This is an argument which I think cuts at the very root of the idea of representative Government. If it were merely a question of contributing to the debate then even 294 are not necessary which is the recommendation of the Commission. The real intention is to bring the people in real contact with the Government as far as possible. That purpose would be better served if the constituency were to be smaller than at present. Even the existing constituencies are fairly big for the members to keep in contact with the voters. If they become bigger it would be still more difficult for a better but a poor candidate to get elected and the parties with large funds will have the position of dominance and advantage. The argument of the House being unwieldy is beside the point and also undemocratic.

Secondly it is argued that if we were to increase the number of seats, we shall be putting an additional burden on the tax payer. It must, however, be remembered that a democratic form of Government is bound to be costly and the consideration of cost must not deter us from doing something that is logical and reasonable. It might be mentioned that the Bombay State Assembly members are drawing probably the least salary, namely, Rs. 150 per month.

Thirdly, it was contended that the multiple should be uniform in all the States as far as possible. In Madras and U.P. it is only 5. Why should Bombay insist on a multiple of 7? At one stage, it was even suggested by some that we should have 5 as our multiple, which would result in the Bombay Assembly consisting of only 245 members. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the MADRAS and UTTAR PRADESH States are so big in size and population that in spite of their small multiple, they have in U.P. 430 members while in Madras now they will have 245. Andhra being a separate State with 168 members. Hence the multiple in their case was small due to their big size and not for the sake of principle. Any attempt to make the multiple uniform will not serve the purpose inasmuch as the conditions are different in different States. Whatever that may be it will not be advisable for the Commission to disturb the *status quo* in our State. The Commission, I respectfully submit, will be doing something which I am afraid, is not within its scope. Their function is to readjust the number of seats on the basis of the changes that might have occurred in the last census. It will not be fair for them to examine the question *de novo*. Such a step would go against the spirit of the legislation and is bound to create misunderstandings and bitterness.

It is my considered opinion, therefore, that we should retain the present multiple of 7 though it might cost a little more to the public exchequer. The disadvantages will be more than compensated by the gain that we make in establishing a more livelier contact with the people.

S. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.,
Associate Member.

MADRAS

So far as the Andhra State Legislative Assembly is concerned I am strongly of the opinion that it can afford to have at least 196 members. In considering the question of the Andhra Assembly it is important to bear in mind that unlike many of the other Part 'A' States the Andhra State will not have a Legislative Council but will have only a Legislative Assembly and that the population of the Andhra State will be little over 20 millions. With this background I find it difficult to appreciate why the Commission considered that a strength of 168 would be sufficient for the Andhra Assembly. Madhya Pradesh has a population of only a few lakhs more than Andhra and yet the Commission has proposed for the Assembly of that State 232 members—sixty four more than that proposed for Andhra. And even in the case of a Part 'B' State like Hyderabad which has a population lesser than that of Andhra by nearly two millions, the Commission has proposed an Assembly strength of 175—7 more than that fixed for Andhra. Such differential treatment of Andhra is not in my view justified. I would suggest that the strength of the Andhra Assembly be placed at 196.

As regards the (residuary) Madras State, I see no reason to differ from the Commission's proposal.

K. RAGHURAMAIAH, M.P.
Associate Member.

WEST BENGAL

I regret to state that I cannot agree with the proposal of the Delimitation Commission so far as the distribution of the seats to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly is concerned. Under the proposal it has been suggested that the *status quo* should be maintained which means that the existing strength of 238 working on the basis of 1 Parliament seat equals to 7 State seats has been maintained. I do not know what special reason has weighed with the Commission apart from not disturbing the existing set up which saves many trouble and botheration. It is an accepted fact that there has been slight increase in population under 1951 census than what it was when the previous number and delimitation of the constituencies were fixed. As the Constitution stands today whatever may be the increase of the population, the total seats to the House of People cannot exceed 500. Therefore the division of seats of the House of People State-wise is quite simple mathematics. Accordingly the West Bengal will get 34 seats as at present. Now therefore the problem arises what should be the multiple so far as the State seats are concerned. Now we have the multiple of seven i.e. 1 House of the People equals to 7 State Assembly. If we consider the proposal in terms of the electorate nearly 1.02 lakhs persons get one representative. And if the same multiple as suggested is maintained 1.04 lakh people will then have one seat. It means that the franchise of the people so far as this right of representation through one representative is concerned is merely shrunk to the extent however small of the variation in the number of persons voting for a representative. Our Constitution deliberately adopted the number of 75,000 as the minimum for distribution of seats and the division of the constituency. But for the sake of expediency it has accepted some other provision in the Constitution such as that the maximum number and the minimum number in the State Assembly should be 500 and 60 respectively. Therefore the intention of the Constitution makers were to bring the number of people getting a representative as near as the Constitutional minimum of 75,000. I therefore suggest that except in the State where the size of the Assembly may exceed the maximum of limitation i.e. 500 all State assemblies must have the number of seats in arriving whereat the population limit is taken as near as the constitutional minimum of 75,000. In our country new experiment is being made about the parliamentary government. Our gigantic general election was the clear indication of the attitude of the people today. Our whole attempt should be to extend and enlarge democratic powers and duties which alone can make the machinery working in proper way. Therefore I suggest that multiple of the West Bengal should be 9 (nine) which would enlarge the house and give greater representation to the people.

Moreover the West Bengal has problems of her own. She is possibly one of most advanced political consciousness. It has the largest cosmopolitan City—Calcutta and its numerous problems including a large working class population and also suburban population. Added to this West Bengal has her own topographical peculiarities specially in Sunderbans which makes normal movement and communication impossible.

It is not a very cogent reasoning that all the States have more or less the same multiple. This is fallacious. Each State has her own problems which are always so varied in character. In the case of many States the constitutional maximum may stand in the way of further enlargement. Moreover there are States including Part 'A' States whose multiple are already higher than West Bengal. The Constitution makers visualised this position.

The difficulties in administration and the increased expenditure which are often put in the way of further enlargement are not tenable. If we consider what the Nation will gain in further expansion of legislature in the context of what she loses in expenditure the balance of advantage will always be for further expansion.

However there was another proposal for fixing the multiple at 8 instead of 7 as it is today and which is proposed to be maintained. I am inclined to accept the same for unanimity. I wish the Delimitation Commission will reconsider the entire issue.

KAMAL KUMAR BASU, M.P.,
Associate Member.

HYDERABAD

1. The total population of the State of Hyderabad as per 1941 census was 1,63,27,119 and an Assembly of 175 gave a representation of one seat per 93,412.

2. If a multiple of 8 is adopted, the Assembly will be of 200 members. The population as per 1951 census is 1,86,55,108 and this will give representation of one member per 93,275 thus maintaining the previous representation equitably.

3. The proposed multiple of seven, giving representation of one member for a population of 1,06,600 while reducing the representation, will create far-flung constituencies.

4. The density of population is low in the State of Hyderabad, namely 227 per sq. mile, and communications are poor in most of the part of the State. The road mileage is many times low compared with other parts of India. If other low density states can claim for manageable constituencies there is no reason why Hyderabad—which has come in the cradle of democratic elections very late—should not be afforded all facilities to render the elections more fair and within the means of the contestants from territorial point of view too.

5. Lastly Hyderabad is a multi-lingual state and the proposed reduction in representation will affect adversely the small linguistic groups.

In view of all this I propose a multiple of '8'.

6. **Representation to Scheduled Castes.**—The census figures for scheduled castes in 1951 are shown as 2,800,184 and accordingly representation of 26 seats is given to them in state Assembly. But the census figures also show that besides the above figure, 288,659 persons have returned themselves as Harijans and Dheds, who cannot but form part of Scheduled Castes.

Hence the representation to Scheduled Castes in the Hyderabad State Assembly should be increased accordingly namely by 3 seats more. That is they should get 29 seats instead of 26.

A. LAXMINARSIMHA REDDY, M.L.A.,
Associate Member.

MYSORE

I think that in view of the fact the Hon'ble Minister for Law Shri Biswas was pleased to announce in the House of the People long before the very question of transfer of a portion of or the entire district of Bellary to Mysore was ever mooted that the readjustment of the seats in the House consequent on the publication of census figures for 1951 entitles the State of Mysore for two more enhanced seats in the House of the People. Shri Biswas, evidently, made the statement on the basis of the figures then supplied by the Election Commission. If we assume the major part of Bellary District of Madras will be transferred to Mysore, then Mysore will be further entitled for one more additional seat in the House of the People as the increase in population of Mysore by virtue of this transfer is about 7,73,712 a little more than the statutory minimum provided for one seat in the

House of the People. I am therefore of the opinion that Mysore State should have 14 seats in the House of the People and not 13 as now proposed by the Commission.

Secondly regarding the number of Seats in the Assembly of Mysore the argument the smaller the Assembly the greater the efficiency of administration will not hold good so far as Mysore State is concerned. Mysore was the pioneer and in fact the earliest of all other States in India to have a Legislative Assembly. In fact it is the special privilege of Mysore, even now to have two Houses of Legislature. Mysore had for nearly about more than half a century a Legislative Assembly comprised of about 300 and more members. In fact the Administration was admittedly reputed to be in no way inferior to any of the other then British Indian Provinces and in some respects, I may be pardoned if I state was held to be even superior and better. The sudden and severe reduction of the number of members of the Assembly from 300 and odd to only 99 has resulted in a serious handicap and has caused not a little set-back for the ever abiding enthusiasm and zeal for public service in the people of Mysore.

There is also a very great disparity in the density of the population varying almost from about 150 to about 300 per square mile.

The larger the number of members the smaller will be the constituency. The smaller the constituency the better the contact of the representative with the masses.

The broader the base for administration the better for democratic working of it.

I therefore on all the above among other considerations crave the indulgence of the Hon'ble Members of the Election Commission to enhance the integral multiple to ten in place of the present nine and *opine* the number of members of the Legislative Assembly of Mysore be 14×10 or 140 or at least in the alternative be at least $13 \times 10 = 130$.

N. KESHAVIENGAR, M.P.,

Associate Member.

TRAVANCORE-COCHIN

It is proposed to fix the strength of our State Assembly at 104. The present strength is 108 which has been fixed on an estimated population of 81 lakhs, since the correct census figures were not available then. Now it is found that the real population of the State is 9,280,425 or 92.8 lakhs. Therefore in the ordinary course the number of representatives should increase instead of decrease.

According to Article 170(2) of the Constitution the representation in the State Legislative Assembly, shall be not more than one member for every 75,000 of the population. On this basis our Assembly may have a strength of 123. But according to the Delimitation Commission Act, Section 8(b) the number of seats assigned to the Legislative Assembly of a State shall form an integral multiple of the total number of seats allotted to that State in the House of the People. The number of seats allotted to our State in the House of the People on the basis of the proportion fixed as per Article 81(b) of the Constitution is 13. Since 123, the maximum number of seats our State may have in the Assembly, is not a multiple of 13, reason demands that we fix a number nearest to 123 which is a multiple of 13. This is 117. This will be 9 times the number of seats allotted to this State in the House of the People which is also the proportion that exists now between our representation in the House of the People and the strength of the Assembly.

Now the proposal is to reduce the seats in the Assembly to 104 while increasing the seats in the House of the People. This does not seem to be proper or even reasonable.

Further, representation is for the people irrespective of the density. If the number is fixed at 104 there will be one member for every 89,234 of the population, whereas if it is fixed at 117 there will be one member for every 79,319 of the population. The latter is a nearer approach to the minimum population of 75,000 fixed for a seat in the Assembly under the Constitution. A working margin of 4,319 is ordinarily enough for practical purposes of delimiting the territorial limits of constituencies without disturbing much the administrative units and geographically compact areas. In any event a variation of 14,234, as in the case of fixing the number at 104, is too much.

It may also be noted that this State is one of the most literate and the people are politically conscious to a very high degree. Both the States of Travancore and Cochin were having Legislatures, consisting of elected representatives based on adult franchise even before the integration. Travancore Legislature had 120 members at the rate of 1 member for every 50,000 of the population of 1941 census. Cochin Legislature had 58 members at the rate of 1 member for every 25,000 of the population. Thus the people have been accustomed to larger representation and smaller constituencies.

A strength of 117 is neither impractical for delimitation nor too high for a Legislature which functioned with 178 members from 1949 to 1952. It may also be noted that in reducing the number of seats in the Assembly to 104 the Scheduled Castes also lose 1 seat.

This is not a very desirable thing in the case of a backward section of the people. One seat to a Scheduled Caste is equal to 2 or 3 seats for others. Even with the present 11 seats the Scheduled Castes, being scattered in different parts of the State, are not able to secure satisfactory representation. Therefore a proposal to fix a number which will also reduce their representation further is not desirable especially when the declared aim of our Constitution is the rapid advancement of the backward classes.

If the seats are fixed at 117 there need be only 95 single member Constituencies and 11 double member Constituencies. Although the margin available for variation is only 4319, not 14,234 if the strength were 104, still delimitation can be effected without disturbing the smallest administrative units. Probably a few exceptions may be necessary. But it can be ascertained only after the actual delimitation is taken up.

It may also be noted that our Assembly in its last session voted against the amendment of Article 81(b) increasing the number of people for a seat in the House of the People. This would show that our Assembly is for greater representation in the Legislature, not for reducing the number of seats with the increase of population.

Therefore, we would suggest that the number of seats in our Assembly be fixed at 117 instead of reducing to 104.

A. SAMRAJ, M.L.A.,

E. P. VARGHESE, M.L.A.,

Associate Members.

VINDHYA PRADESH

The Delimitation Commission under Section 8 (1) of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952, proposes that the number of seats allotted to Vindhya Pradesh in the House of the People be reduced from six to five. One seat each is reserved for Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, thereby reducing the number of general seats from 4 to 3.

2. For the purposes of the last general elections the total population of India was determined under the President's order to be 347.3 millions. The total population of Vindhya Pradesh was 38.79 lakhs. The total population of India for the purposes of next general elections based on the Census figures of 1951 is 256.7 millions (registered an increase of 11 millions). The population of Vindhya Pradesh is now 35.74 lakhs only (registering a decrease of about 3 lakhs), the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes numbering 4.76 and 4.18 lakhs respectively.

3. We submit, therefore, that when reservations have to be made for one or more sections of the population the proper thing would be to work out the number of the reserved seats first. After that an all India average for one general seat be worked out by dividing the figures of total general population with the figures of seats available as general seats. The all India average for 1 seat in the House of the People may thus work out at 7.3 and Vindhya Pradesh in that case might become entitled to 3.6 general seats. While we appreciate that one seat each is reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, at the same time we sincerely feel that by reducing one general seat, general representation has greatly been affected.

4. Further, Vindhya Pradesh is a Part C State and should be on equal footing with other Part C States. But a survey of the figures of respective populations, areas and seats allotted to Himachal Pradesh, Bhopal and Delhi along with Vindhya Pradesh gives an impression that Vindhya Pradesh has not received a fair deal under the new proposals.

- I Himachal Pradesh with a population of 9.8 lakhs gets 2 seats or 4.9 lakhs per seat; deducting the population of Scheduled Castes the representation per seat is 3.8 lakhs.
- II Delhi with a population of 17.4 lakhs gets 3 seats or 5.8 lakhs per seat. Deducting the population of Scheduled Castes, the representation per seat is 5.1 lakhs.
- III Bhopal with a population of 8.4 lakhs gets 2 seats or 4.2 lakhs per seat. Deducting the population of Scheduled Castes, the representation per seat is 3.2 lakhs.
- IV Vindhya Pradesh with a population of 35.7 lakhs gets only 5 seats or 7.1 lakhs per seat. But deducting the population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the representation given to them, the representation per general seat now comes up to 8.9 lakhs per seat.
5. Even comparing the area of Vindhya Pradesh with that of Bhopal and Delhi the proportion of representation per seat does not appear to be just and reasonable, as far as Vindhya Pradesh is concerned. The figures work out as:

Bhopal—3,439 sq. miles per seat.

Delhi—192 sq. miles per seat.

Vindhya Pradesh—4,720 sq. miles per seat.

6. From the facts stated above it is evident that Vindhya Pradesh which though a Part C State is put up par with A and B States, as far as the representation to the House of the People is concerned, while other Part C States continue to enjoy a special privilege.

7. In our opinion, therefore, Vindhya Pradesh should continue to have FOUR general seats in the House of the People. This would mean a population of 6.7 lakhs per *general seat* i.e., deducting the population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the seats reserved for them. But even taking all the seats the representation would still remain 5.8 lakhs per seat which is a much higher figure as compared with other Part C States, namely Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, and Bhopal, all of which have popular governments in their respective States as Vindhya Pradesh.

8. Apart from the above facts, Vindhya Pradesh being thinly populated area with rich agricultural lands, the Government of the Pradesh has offered to rehabilitate refugees from both the East and West Pakistan, as well as people from any other part of the country. This is sure to increase the population of the State by several lakhs in no time.

SHIVA DUTT UPADHYAYA, M.P.,

RAM SAHAI TIWARI, M.P.,

Associate Members.

DELHI

The Delimitation Commission has proposed three seats for the Delhi State in the House of the People. This reduces by one the existing four seats allotted to it under Section 3 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, out of which one was reserved for a representative of the Scheduled Castes. We are unable to agree with this recommendation of the Delimitation Commission. In our opinion certain special circumstances have to be taken into account in allocating seats for the Delhi State in the House of the People.

Delhi as the Capital occupies a special position in the country. It is a cosmopolitan city where large numbers of people from all parts of India have come and settled down. With the influx of the refugees, its problems have become more varied and complicated.

The Delhi State Legislature enjoys limited powers far less than those enjoyed by many other Part C States. It is not permitted to legislate upon such important subjects as:

(a) Public order;

(b) Police including railway police;

(c) the constitution and powers of municipal corporations and other local authorities, of improvement trusts and of water supply, drainage, electricity, transport and other public utility authorities in Delhi or New Delhi;

- (d) jurisdiction and powers of all courts, with respect to any of the said matters..... (Vide Section 21 (i) of the Government of Part C States Act.....Act XLIV of 1951).

These powers vest in the Union Government, so far as the Delhi State is concerned, and the Union Government is responsible only to the Parliament. It is, therefore, all the more necessary that the voice of the people of Delhi in all these and allied matters should be effectively heard in Parliament.

The population of Delhi State has been increasing during the last few years at a very rapid rate for obvious reasons. This increase is bound to continue in the coming years at a rate which is not likely to be registered in any of the other cities of India. Perhaps this factor weighed also with the authorities when the original number of seats was fixed at four. This should not be lost sight of now.

Delhi comes under the category of Part C States. If the present trends are to continue, many of the Part C States in our country are likely to be merged with the neighbouring A or B States. No special reasons stand against such a merger. But in the case of Delhi, such a contingency is not likely to arise. Being the Capital and the seat of the Union Government it cannot be merged with any neighbouring State. It has, therefore, always got to find direct and effective representation in the House of the People.

At present the Commission has allocated seats in the House of the People to the various States on the basis of one territorial constituency per population of 7,36,070. This has been done as follows:

| | | |
|---|-----|--------------|
| Total number of seats | ... | 500. |
| Less Jammu & Kashmir | ... | 6. |
| Part C States | ... | 21. |
| Nominated | ... | 2. |
| Nominated | ... | 2. |
| Therefore, number of seats to be allotted for | | |
| Part A and Part B States | ... | 471. |
| Population of Part A and B States | ... | 346,689,040. |

Dividing the population by the number of seats (471), the figure of 7,36,070 population per territorial constituency has been arrived at. If our suggestion for an extra seat for Delhi is accepted, it would still not upset the total number of seats to be filled by election, which is 500; whereas the Commission has only allotted 498 seats to be filled by election as can be seen from the above calculation. Even otherwise, instead of setting apart 21 seats for Part C States, if 22 are set apart, giving the extra seat for Delhi, the total number of seats for Part A and Part B States will be 470 instead of 471 and the population per constituency will only increase by a thousand. This will make little difference in the allotment already made by the Commission for the other States.

Undue emphasis on Article 81(c) of the Constitution without giving due weight to the proviso "so far as practicable" has apparently led the Delimitation Commission to fix the seats throughout the territory of India on the basis of uniform ratio between the number of members allotted to each territorial constituency and the population of that constituency. If due consideration is given to Article 81(b) then, on the basis of "not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population", Delhi can be allotted the existing four seats for its population of over 17 lakhs. The fact that the population per seat for the Legislative Assembly in Uttar Pradesh is over a lakh and in Delhi it is only 36,000 also lends support to the claim of Delhi for preferential treatment even as regards its representation in the House of the People.

The reduction in the number of seats for Delhi in the House of the People is sought to be made by a rigid interpretation of the proviso that "no reduction shall be made in the number of seats in the House of the People at present allotted to any Part C State which has no Legislative Assembly", attached to Article 8(b) of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952. But, we have pointed out above that the powers given to the Delhi State Legislative Assembly are so limited that for all practical purposes there is little difference between the status of Delhi and other C States which have no legislature. This proviso also does not prevent the Delimitation Commission from giving an extra seat to any Part C State which has a Legislative Assembly, for it cannot be stretched to mean that in the case of a Part C State which has a Legislative Assembly and which is enjoying weightage this should be reduced. Therefore, we feel that this proviso should be more liberally interpreted in the spirit of the Constitution.

SUCHETA KRIPALANI, M.P.,

MIR MUSHTAQ AHMED, M.L.A.,

FATEH SINGH, M.L.A.,

Associate Members,

HIMACHAL PRADESH

The part C States were created under certain special considerations because the then Government was quite aware of the backwardness of these areas and thus some weightage in representation to the House of the People was granted just to bring the C States to the level of the other advanced States of India. The present proposed reduction in Parliamentary seats from the C States will hinder their progress and it will be a great injustice to the entire population of these States. It is crystal clear that under the garb of democracy "The Giant Exploiter" is acting or has appeared in the shape of this Commission to encroach upon the rights of weaker section of the people of C States and India as a whole. If the Commission is really willing it can fairly recommend some constitutional changes wherever felt necessary.

The Commission has neglected the cause of the Scheduled Castes and tribes. Wherever a reduction in the seats is being proposed, only the reserved seats are effected. In regard to Assembly seats no consideration has been given to the Scheduled castes in such areas where they have majority of population. Proper course would have been to reconstitute the Assembly constituencies and declare only those constituencies double where scheduled castes are thickly populated. Lastly I come to the curious circumstances which are prevailing in Himachal Pradesh. Here I would like to press that it is a border state, with scattered population over a large area where means of communications are still inadequate. People of smaller States had been continuously exploited by the then rulers of these States. It cannot be presumed that within these few years the people have been benefitted so much that they do not need any more concessions. Majority of population is illiterate and due to lack of Industrial development there is economic crisis. Untouchability is still existing and if no reserve seat is earmarked for these people, they will be deprived of their even birth rights. The Scheduled Castes should be allowed to enjoy this concession for at least one more general election and thereafter the circumstances will take care of themselves.

I again request the Commission to reconsider their decision.

GOPI RAM, M.P.,
Associate Member.

[No. 53/29/53.]

P. S. SUBRAMANIAN, Secy.